



REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Drawings

Figures 2-6 have been objected for not including the legend "Prior Art." Applicants have corrected the drawing and replacement sheets are being submitted herewith.

Claim Objections

Claim 12 has been objected to for containing certain informality. Claim 12 has been amended to remove the informality.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-4 and 10-14 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 8-10 of copending Application No. 10/085,562.

Applicants respectfully offer to submit a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) upon determination of allowability of these claims.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 11, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by applicant's background of the invention and admitted prior art figs. 1-6. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants respectfully point to the Examiner that in figures 1-6 Applicants have described a prior art method that detects boundaries between different sequences by correlating pairs of sample values in which a first sample value is compared with a second sample value and

the second sample value is then compared with a third sample value and so on (see figure 6, elements 610). In contrast, claim 1 recites correlating a plurality of received digital sample values with a single digital sample value. This aspect of the claimed invention is shown and described in figures 7 and 9a-c. Claim 1 has been amended to further clarify this aspect. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the prior art.

Claims 2, 9, 10, 11, 13 and 14 depend from claim 1 and are patentably distinguishable from prior art for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's background of the invention.

Claim 12 depends from claim 1, which has been distinguished from the prior art failing to disclose correlating a single digital sample value with a plurality of received digital sample values. Accordingly, claim 12 is patentably distinguishable from the prior art for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Applicant believes this application and the claims herein to be in a condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have further inquiry concerning these matters, please contact the below named attorney for Applicant.

Respectfully submitted,



Abdul Zindani
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 46,091

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-5137